

# **BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES**

**March 23, 2000**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman David Williams called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

**ROLL CALL:** Present were Chairman David Williams; Board Members Walter Lemon III, Anissa Crane, Renee Cannon and Stewart Straus. Board Members Hal Beighley and Monty Edberg were excused.

Senior Planner John Osterberg, Assistant Planner Sambo Kirkman, Assistant Planner Liz Shotwell and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

## **VISITORS:**

Chairman Williams read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

Chairman Williams opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the meeting. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

Senior Planner John Osterberg introduced Assistant Planner Sambo Kirkman and Assistant Planner Liz Shotwell, who will be monitoring the Public Hearing tonight and learning from the Board of Design Review.

Mentioning that he is appearing on behalf of Associate Planner Colin Cooper regarding both the Pilgrim Lutheran Church Gym Addition Design Variance and Type 3 Design Review, Mr. Osterberg stated that he would attempt to respond to any questions. He observed that the applicant should be able to provide necessary information as well. He

pointed out that two separate items are scheduled for Public Hearing with regard to the Pilgrim Lutheran Church Gym Addition, recommending that the Public Hearing on both items be held at the same time, during which time all testimony can be considered.

Chairman Williams agreed that the Public Hearing be held on both items concurrently.

### **PILGRIM LUTHERAN CHURCH GYM ADDITION**

The following land use applications have been submitted to add approximately 25,400 square feet and remodel 3,700 square feet to the existing church located at 5650 SW Hall Boulevard. The addition and remodel will take place in two phases. Pilgrim Lutheran Church is located on 2.06 acres of land located at the northeast corner of SW Hall Boulevard and SW 12<sup>th</sup> Street. The church site is located on Tax Lot 3000 of Assessor's Map 1S1-15CC and is zoned Urban Medium Residential (R-2).

#### **A. VAR 2000-0002 – DESIGN VARIANCE**

Request for a Design Variance approval to allow a 20-foot reduction of the rear yard setback from the required 30-foot setback to approximately 10-feet.

Mr. Osterberg presented the Staff Report for the design variance, explaining that the request includes two specific variances, the first requiring a variance from a second 30-foot setback standard to a 10-foot setback on the north property line. He mentioned the previous history of design review approvals, which includes a design variance in 1988, for the same setback requested at this time. The building that was approved in 1988 has since been proposed for demolition, with a new building, at the same setback line, proposed at this time, and the new building would be no closer than the previous building. He noted that staff has reviewed the Design Variance, which meets all applicable criteria, and has recommended approval, with six conditions of approval, all of which are considered standard design variances.

#### **B. BDR 99-00104 – TYPE III DESIGN REVIEW**

Request for Design Review approval of the proposed 25,400 square foot addition and 3,700 square foot remodel. The proposal includes new additions to the existing building, a new loading berth and new bicycle parking.

Mr. John Osterberg presented the Staff Report for the design review, explaining that staff has reviewed the proposal, which meets all applicable criteria, and has recommended approval, with 21 conditions of approval, all of which the Board of Design Review is familiar with. He noted that Condition 21 provides that the Design Review approval is subject to the final approval of the design variance (VAR 2000-0002) also being heard at this time, which is a relatively standard procedure.

Noting that this concludes his summary of the Staff Reports, he stated that he is happy to respond to any questions at this time.

Pointing out that the applicant may have this information; Mr. Straus questioned whether the lot line adjustment for accommodation of the building completed or whether it is still in the proposal stage.

Mr. Osterberg stated that he would like to check on this issue.

On behalf of the applicant, Barry Boe confirmed that this lot line adjustment had been approved.

Mr. Osterberg expressed appreciation to Mr. Boe for this information.

Ms. Crane observed that there had been no change in the number of parking spaces in conjunction with the proposed addition, questioning whether it will be sufficient.

Mr. Osterberg informed Ms. Crane that the parking is sufficient and that the parking for a church in almost all cases is based upon the number of spaces necessary for – based upon the size of the main sanctuary or the primary area of worship. Although multiple elements of the church use are present, they are in use at overlapping time periods, are not considered separate uses in and of themselves and do not increase the parking requirement.

Ms. Cannon questioned the criteria utilized to determine the amount of parking spaces.

On behalf of the applicant, Bob Thrapp informed Ms. Cannon that linear feet of pew space available determine parking.

Mr. Osterberg commented that there are two specific methods to determine parking requirements: 1) fixed seating, such as pews; and 2) flexible seating, allowing for multi-purpose rooms, adding that the applicant is utilizing one of these two allowed standards.

Ms. Cannon thanked Mr. Osterberg and the applicant for addressing her concerns.

### **APPLICANT:**

**BOB THRAPP** 1220 SW Morrison Street #600, Portland, OR 97205, representing Peck Smiley Ettlin Architects, architects for Pilgrim Lutheran Church; and **BARRY BOE** 11470 SW Ridgecrest Drive, Beaverton, OR, filling in for Ken Calkins, who is the Chairman of the Building Committee for Pilgrim Lutheran Church, appeared in support of Pilgrim Lutheran Church Gym Addition's applications for VAR 2000-0002 – Design Variance and BDR 99-00104 – Type 3 Design Review.

Mr. Thrapp presented a map of the proposed project and explained that the site is extremely tight given the position of the existing church and school. He mentioned their excellent relationship with the neighbors to the north, who had agreed to a land swap to allow the church to allow for the feasibility of this project, providing for a full-size gymnasium and necessary classrooms to allow the facility to function. Observing that the design of the building has created a great challenge to attempt to mimic some of the existing church forms, he noted that the fly loft on the west elevation mimics, while still deferring to, the existing sanctuary steeple. He mentioned that the beautiful stained glass windows would be retained as a focussed feature. Noting that attempts had been made for the building to remain as low as possible, he reported that the floor heights are only 10 foot 6 inches, which matches the existing height of the school as closely as possible while maintaining a proper entry from the parking lot side. Commenting that this had been a quick summary of the project, he offered to respond to any questions at this time.

Mr. Lemon mentioned that the basic material on the north elevation is panel board, noting that he is not exactly certain what this product is, although he assumes it is some sort of a 5/8's or 3/4's material with a smooth manufactured texture of some sort.

Mr. Thrapp informed Mr. Lemon that the brand name of this material is *Hardi-Panel*, which is 3/8's to 1/2-inch thick, adding that there are actually 1-1/2-inch to 2-inch bats on top of this material, with flashing.

Mr. Lemon questioned Mr. Thrapp's reference to bats – whether he means bats at the panel board themselves, does it have a board-and-bat appearance, or are the bats metrically... He emphasized that he is concerned about this particular issue because there is such a great expanse of material, adding that although Hall is a one-way street, drivers traveling north will view this in their rear-view mirrors, as well as neighbors who will have this view.

Mr. Thrapp observed that the bats are only at the panel joints, adding that there is some horizontal banding with some vertical segments, indicating that the bats are located at the finer lines on the drawing.

Mr. Lemon mentioned that the elevations of the drawing indicate a layout of joints, questioning whether that layout represents the bat layer the architect intends to utilize.

Mr. Thrapp confirmed that the layout Mr. Lemon referred to does represent the bat layer to be used.

Mr. Lemon questioned whether the bats are one by four.

Mr. Thrapp informed Mr. Lemon that the bats are actually one by two, adding that they are attempting to keep them as minimal as possible. He added that some of the information is outdated and indicated the latest material that is available.

Mr. Lemon questioned the texture and material of these bats.

Mr. Thrapp observed that between the classroom bays there would be a two-foot by two-foot recess, which will also break up the façade.

Mr. Lemon indicated that this detail is included in Phase 2, which he assumes will occur in a year or two.

Mr. Thrapp informed Mr. Lemon that the applicant is hoping to roll the phases.

Mr. Lemon stated that in this event, he would see them in another six months or so. He noted that the phase is broken up somewhat with the windows and setbacks, and mentioned that there had been some reference to a stucco material.

Mr. Thrapp confirmed that there had been some discussion of utilizing stucco.

Mr. Lemon discussed different materials that had been mentioned, including brick, veneer, stucco, cementuous with an acrylic top coat and cement-board beveled siding, which is comparable to a lap siding or an LP siding out of hardiplank.

Mr. Thrapp confirmed Mr. Lemon's description of cement-board beveled siding.

Mr. Lemon noted that some of these materials, such as the cementuous with an acrylic topcoat, are no longer in the scenario for the project.

Mr. Thrapp advised Mr. Lemon that there had been changes due to budgetary considerations.

Ms. Crane questioned whether the entire building would be painted.

Mr. Thrapp assured Ms. Crane that with the exception of the brick, the entire project would be painted.

Observing that she had noticed that the old building appears kind of red, Ms. Crane questioned whether the portion of the old building that remains will be repainted to match the new addition or would it remain the same as it is at this time.

Mr. Thrapp indicated that there are actually some wood in-fill panels on the elevations, adding that the architect intends to match the existing color scheme of

the building, with the intent that the brick match the existing brick color and the areas to be painted to match the existing painted areas.

Ms. Crane requested clarification, noting that the existing paint appears to be a rusty red.

Mr. Thrapp clarified that the existing paint is a rusty red in color.

Mr. Straus questioned whether the main color is a rusty red.

Mr. Thrapp conformed that the main color of the project is a rusty red.

Mr. Straus questioned the colors for the trim and fascias on the building.

Mr. Thrapp indicated that the colors of the trim and fascia of the building are limited, adding that there will be metal doors and that the fascia, which is only about four inches on the top, matches the existing structure as well.

Mr. Straus requested that Mr. Thrapp explain about how the area of the stage relates to the roof of the gym and what happens to the east side, expressing his opinion that it appears to be sort of stuck up in the air.

Mr. Thrapp indicated that the sanctuary is located throughout the structure, adding that they have created a fly loft. He noted that the existing roof slope is 14 and 12, and their plans are for 12 and 12, which is close enough to be visually comparable. The fascia detail mimics the existing fascia, although the existing fascia has an overhang, which they had not duplicated because they are already so close to the setback line. He noted that they had not gone across that because it had created many structural difficulties with the gymnasium.

Noting that this is a sloped roof, Mr. Straus asked Mr. Thrapp how much of the height is above the level that is required for the function of the fly wall.

Mr. Thrapp informed Mr. Straus that given the width of the stage opening, this point is probably located right at the top of the gymnasium peak, adding that lights will be installed at the very top.

Mr. Straus observed that he is attempting to determine what that portion sticking up is going to look like, adding that it appears to have an uncomfortable feeling, in his opinion. He noted that although he understands why it was done, unfortunately most of the view of this building is going to be primarily coming from the south and there will be that piece sticking up by itself. Although it is looking straight on and is intended to mimic the end of the sanctuary, in his opinion it will appear to be an incomplete idea. He commented that he is not attempting to redesign the building, but this feature seems slightly uncomfortable

to him. He questioned whether another method is available to achieve the same idea without appearing to have been chopped off in the middle of the thought.

Mr. Thrapp informed Mr. Straus that several options for sloping had been designed, adding that they had proven to be structurally prohibitive did look at a couple of options – prohibitive structurally, with what would be necessary to span that. He observed that there has been some difficulty coordinating what is structurally feasible with the desired appearance.

Emphasizing that it is not his job to redesign the project, Mr. Straus expressed his concern with structures that may appear awkward, strange or out-of-place.

Mr. Straus referred to the landscaping, noting that an existing hedge appears to remain right up against the wall of the building, asking how they propose to retain the hedge, considering the delicacy of construction workers.

Mr. Thrapp informed Mr. Straus that he intends to indicate to the construction workers that it is important to attempt to retain as much of the existing hedge as possible, although they will replant, as closely as possible, if necessary. He emphasized that they hope not to cause any damage.

Mr. Straus wished Mr. Thrapp good luck with this particular effort. He repeated Mr. Lemon's concern with the large expanse of building wall at the end of the gym, expressing his opinion that this provides an opportunity for landscaping similar to what has been done at the north side of the entry drive to the Elsie Stuhr Center. He emphasized that this might help to mitigate the great expanse of wall, adding that there are no other practical means of dealing with this available to them. He questioned the possibility of providing some additional, fairly large-scale trees and shrubs in this area.

Mr. Thrapp questioned whether the intent is to separate the Pilgrim Lutheran Church from the Elsie Stuhr Center.

Mr. Straus indicated that the purpose is not so much for separation, but mainly to break up the expanse of wall, adding that the landscaping would provide some visual relief without having to change the design of the structure itself.

Mr. Thrapp referred to the site plan, noting that at this location there is the existing hedge, Pondorosa Pine and Blue Spruce.

Mr. Straus explained that between these points there is a rather large void that could be improved considerably with the addition of a couple of fairly good-sized trees, asking how Mr. Thrapp feels about this suggestion.

Mr. Thrapp stated that he does not necessarily have a problem with planting between the hedges, as well as on the Elsie Stuhr Center, although he does not

feel comfortable speaking for the adjacent property owner. He noted that if representatives of the Elsie Stuhr Center agree, there should be no problem associated with providing some landscaping there as well.

Mr. Osterberg cautioned that the Elsie Stuhr Center is located on a different tax lot.

Chairman Williams informed Mr. Osterberg that they are aware that the Elsie Stuhr Center is located on another tax lot, adding that according to the drawing, it appears they are planting there.

Mr. Straus observed that other landscaping appears to be planned on the Elsie Stuhr Center in connection with this project.

Mr. Thrapp advised that their intent is only to replace what is existing at this time, adding that if the Fire Marshall determines that the road has to be relocated, the area will be replanted.

Mr. Straus stated that if permission had already been obtained for this replanting, he assumes there also exists the option of potentially locating trees in more strategic locations.

Mr. Thrapp agreed, adding that he has no problem with this possibility.

Mr. Straus requested clarification of the two phases of this project.

Mr. Thrapp indicated that the applicant would prefer to complete both phases sequentially. On question, he informed Mr. Straus that the application includes both phases of the project, adding that it had been submitted as a single project that will hopefully be completed within two years.

Mr. Lemon requested clarification from Mr. Osterberg on whether this application includes both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this project.

Mr. Osterberg confirmed that the application includes both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project, adding that it is reflected on the applicant's plans.

Mr. Lemon observed that he has a concern with this situation, stating that although this is indicated in the plans, the Staff Report is for a gym addition and does not clearly indicate that both phases are included. He noted that earlier the applicant had mentioned rolling the project over from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and he had indicated he would see them again in approximately six months, referring to the application for Phase 2. He expressed concern that this may create problems if the public is not aware of the entire scope of the project.



Ms. Cannon commented that at the Neighborhood Meeting it had been brought up that both phases are included in this application.

Mr. Osterberg informed Chairman Williams that the application requests approval of both phases up front, adding that the applicant may complete the phases concurrently or consecutively, which is reflected in the Staff Report and was included in the Public Notice. He mentioned that while the planting of the trees of the site can conceivably work out, the applicant can provide only half of this agreement. He cautioned that there may be a problem of the Park District disagreed, which would prevent the applicant from carrying out that particular condition of approval.

Chairman Williams commented that the Board understands that that amendment would have to conditional.

Mr. Osterberg suggested that this amendment be made conditional or that the issue is addressed in some other manner.

Ms. Cannon requested clarification from Mr. Straus of where these additional trees are to be located.

Mr. Straus indicated the general area that the additional trees will be located.

Ms. Cannon discussed the landscaping, noting that they have pines in one location and a hedge in another.

Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that the hedge will be destroyed in the course of building the structure, noting that it is located within a foot or two of the structure. He noted that it is unlikely that a scaffold can be set up and siding and other components of the structure installed while preserving that hedge, adding that these workers are not brain surgeons.

Ms. Cannon agreed that these workers are not brain surgeons, adding that they are not architects either. She expressed her opinion that the applicant is being requested to do more than necessary, adding that the only individuals who will actually view this will be walking on Hall Boulevard. She stressed that there are already two existing large 14-inch caliper trees across the way that will provide screening already. She mentioned that there is existing Ponderosa Pine and Blue Spruce, noting that dollars are being added to this project for no reason.

Mr. Straus advised Ms. Cannon that they are replacing a number of trees over there by suggesting to simply relocate or adjust the locations of trees that they are otherwise providing to places that will perhaps better fill in the gaps and help mitigate the expanse of wall.

Ms. Cannon questioned what Liquid Ambers are.

Mr. Straus informed Ms. Cannon that a Liquid Amber is a deciduous tree – a sweet gum.

Mr. Cannon referred to 14-inch calipers, indicating how big around this is.

Mr. Straus indicated that these trees would be approximately 30 or 40 feet high.

Ms. Cannon expressed her opinion that 30 or 40 feet is going to cover the front of the entire structure, adding that the branches will be there already. She repeated that the only individuals who will actually view this are the people walking on Hall Boulevard. She stressed that the property is covered with existing trees anyway and she sees no reason to mess up their plan, adding that there is already an agreement with the Elsie Stuhr Center in the event the Fire Marshall requires that the road be made wider. She expressed her opinion that this situation amounts to an overkill.

Chairman Williams observed that it takes some time for trees to reach a certain height.

Ms. Cannon noted that these trees are already 30 or 40 feet high.

Chairman Williams stated that sweet gums grow narrow until they reach a certain height.

Ms. Cannon stated that she had a sweet gum in her yard.

Chairman Williams indicated that they have bright red leaves.

Ms. Cannon informed the applicant that she likes the building.

Chairman Williams expressed his opinion that most people would not notice this building, although those who do may think it has a strange appearance, like a western storefront with nothing behind it. He noted that considering the manner in which the structure will be broken up, it would most likely not appear to be so much out of character.

Mr. Straus considered what the alternatives might be for the structure, concerning the shape or the layout, adding that the plan at least attempts to blend with what is currently on the location and that any other shape might be even more obtrusive.

Expressing his opinion that stained glass is a wonderful feature, Chairman Williams noted that if the new façade matches the old façade, most people would not even notice any difference. He discussed the proposal to move the tree in closer to the gymnasium, stressing that in general, the Board of Design Review has a sensitivity to having big, blank walls at any location, adding that they tend

to show up more frequently if they don't monitor the situation. He pointed out that a blank, three-story building looming down upon a neighborhood could be rather atrocious. Observing that those who see that end of the building will be across the street on Hall Boulevard, he noted that the Elsie Stuhr Center will be effectively blocked by angling and by the existing trees. Traffic going down Hall Boulevard will be traveling the wrong direction to view this wall, and even the neighbors across the street will be provided some relief by the pines and sweet gums that are partially blocking the structure. He stressed that just on general principal, he would prefer to see a tree at that location, although the drawing does not show all of the elements that will tend to break up the appearance of the façade.

Chairman Williams asked if there were any further questions or comments, reminding those present that both the Design Variance and the Type 3 Design Review are being considered at this time.

Mr. Straus referred to the variance, noting that the suggestion for trees is actually a mitigation for allowing the variance more than anything else. Under normal circumstances, that wall, at that height, would be 30-feet, rather than 10-feet, away from the property line. He noted that he is not thinking in terms so much of those driving down Hall Boulevard, but for those driving into the driveway going to the Elsie Stuhr Center, there will be basically nothing in their foreground between them and that wall. He expressed his opinion that this seems to be insensitive, commenting that as a trade-off for the variance, some foreground planting should be provided in that area to make the experience slightly less overwhelmed by the scale of the building.

Ms. Cannon noted that coming down Hall Boulevard, only a right turn is permitted at that location, adding that drivers will view the trees on their left as they turn in. She expressed her opinion that they would experience turning left, going past the wall practically before even becoming aware that it is there. She mentioned that they share some of their parking spaces with the Elsie Stuhr Center on certain days, expressing her opinion that this variance is only increasing the ability for the entire community to utilize this building and enhance the senior citizen center as well. She noted that the only way to enter this site is to turn right.

Mr. Straus confirmed that this is the entrance to the Elsie Stuhr Center.

Ms. Cannon noted that if drivers were turning left, they would experience this wall, although by turning right, they will experience what is across the street, not the wall. She pointed out that she does not personally drive and have experiences of walls.

Mr. Straus observed that this might be due to the fact that Ms. Cannon is not an architect.

Ms. Cannon asked Mr. Straus how much of the population are architects.

Mr. Straus questioned whether it is a big expense to move a tree from one location to another location on the same site.

On question, Mr. Thrapp informed Chairman Williams that the mechanical units would be located on the top of the roof, in the middle of the roof and also on the lower roof area.

Ms. Cannon indicated an area on the drawing, questioning whether that is the proposed location of the mechanical units.

Mr. Thrapp informed Ms. Cannon that that area is a skylight, adding that there will be a mechanical unit between the skylights and the others right in the center of the proposed school addition.

Chairman Williams noted that according to the north elevation, there is a mechanical unit sitting in front of a view of the skylight, questioning how high this is.

Mr. Thrapp informed Chairman Williams that he believes it is approximately 3-1/2 feet tall.

Chairman Williams questioned how much parapet is in that location.

Mr. Thrapp clarified that the parapet in that location varies from 12 to 24 inches.

Mr. Lemon mentioned that one of the board standard clauses or conditions states that the mechanical units have to be screened from public view with materials to match the existing material, adding that Chairman Williams is indicating due to their proximity to the parapet, these units are very likely going to be visible.

Mr. Thrapp commented that these mechanical units would be located approximately 20-feet back from the parapet.

Ms. Cannon questioned the existence of a formula to determine how this works.

Mr. Thrapp informed Ms. Cannon that it is necessary to draw it out to determine the range that the units can be seen.

Ms. Cannon stated that the mechanical units on Fred Meyer are clearly visible when traveling down Highway 217.

Mr. Straus informed Ms. Cannon that it is not possible to screen such a situation from an overhead view.

Mr. Lemon discussed a situation concerning the South Ridge High School that has been recently completed, adding that the applicant needs to keep in mind that the Board of Design Review does receive input throughout these projects.

Mr. Osterberg commented that the applicant describe at this time what material will be used or the possibility that the board can indicate a parameter on the range of materials that should be allowed, to provide for more detail than simply stating "it shall be screened". He suggested that in the event they don't feel comfortable with the setback 20 feet from the parapet wall at that location, the Board may choose explore options to further ensure that the screening would be adequate.

Expressing his opinion that there is a good chance that the mechanical equipment will not be visible, Chairman Williams noted that a revision to Condition of Approval No. 12 should resolve the issue.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

This being the time for public comment on the Public Hearing, it was observed that no one appeared to testify at this time.

Chairman Williams questioned whether staff wishes to comment further on this issue.

Mr. Osterberg recommended that the Board may wish to include a condition of approval which allows for the removal of all or a portion of that hedge and require either replacement of that hedge or some other similar evergreen hedge-like material.

Chairman Williams commented that there is currently a mix of photinia, rhododendron and cotton easter.

Mr. Osterberg stated that it already has a mix and their intent is just to match what is currently there, though there could be some provisions regarding size.

Chairman Williams stated that he is unsure what type that hedge is.

Mr. Thrapp explained that he thinks the hedge is four or five feet high.

Chairman Williams clarified that the applicant would not be expected to put a five foot petunia back in there, adding that a three to five gallon shrub to match the existing shrub should be adequate.

Chairman Williams closed the public testimony portion of the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lemon **MOVED** and Mr. Straus **SECONDED** a motion for approval of VAR 2000-0002 -- Pilgrim Lutheran Church Gym Addition Design Variance, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated March 23, 2000, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 6.

Motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

Mr. Lemon **MOVED** and Mr. Straus **SECONDED** a motion for approval of BDR 99-00104 – Pilgrim Lutheran Church Gym Addition Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated March 23, 2000, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 21, with the following modifications to Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 21 and additional conditions:

12. All mechanical equipment, vents, and utility meters shall be screened from public view and made an integral part of the structure. The construction material for any rooftop equipment screens shall be the same plate siding material and color as the building siding.
22. The material listed in the Board of Design Review package (description of materials and finishes) shall be changed to delete the stucco with the acrylic top coat and cement board beveled siding. The material to replace these items shall be cementitious panel siding with one by two bats, laid out as indicated on sheet 83.1 dated March 3, 2000.
23. All plant material which is shown as existing shall be replaced with the same species and similar size, should that plant material be damaged or removed during the construction process.
24. Provided that the applicant can get approval from the Senior Center management and the Park District, an additional tree shall be placed in-line with the gym ridge roof ridgeline and in the area south of the proposed road. The tree shall be similar in size to the additional red Maples being planted to the north of the proposed road.

Ms. Cannon requested clarification of whether this motion added the tree that had been discussed.

Mr. Lemon confirmed that this motion adds the tree that had been discussed.

Ms. Cannon questioned why this tree is being added.

Ms. Crane expressed her opinion that this tree should not be added, adding that the applicant is most likely on a limited budget.

Ms. Cannon expressed concern with the location of the proposed tree, adding that they had indicated the same size, which are 14-inch caliper trees.

Chairman Williams clarified that these are not the 14-inch caliper trees, but the Red Maples in the yard.

Mr. Straus explained that new trees are being added.

Chairman Williams questioned whether these new trees have a two-inch diameter.

Ms. Cannon announced that she does not agree with the addition of this tree.

Mr. Straus informed Chairman Williams that these are two-inch diameter trees.

Ms. Crane questioned where this additional tree would be located.

Mr. Lemon indicated where this additional tree would be located.

Motion, with amendments and additions, **CARRIED** by the following roll call vote.

Ayes: Lemon  
Straus  
Williams

Nays: Cannon  
Crane

7:38 p.m. – At the request of Mr. Osterberg, Chairman Williams granted a break to allow the applicant for the next Public Hearing to set up their informational materials.

7:48 p.m. – the meeting resumed.

### **WATERFORD PARK**

The following land use applications have been submitted for a 40-unit townhouse development on 2.10 acres of land located on the west side of SW 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue, south of SW Flagstone Drive. Access to the project is proposed off SW Flagstone Drive. The development proposal is located on Tax Lot 5500 of Assessor's Map 1S1-29BD and is zoned Urban Medium Residential (R-2).

#### **A. VAR 99-00027 – DESIGN VARIANCE**

Request for a Design Variance approval to allow a 6-foot reduction of the front yard setback from the standard 20-foot setback from the standard 20-foot setback to approximately 14-feet. This reduction in setback would be applied to units 18 through 24, which are proposed adjacent to SW 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**B. BDR 99-00223 – TYPE III DESIGN REVIEW**

Request for Design Review approval of the proposed 40-unit Waterford Park townhouse community. The proposal includes new buildings, landscaping, streets, driveways and parking areas.

Noting that the Waterford Park Development also has two applications, both hearings of which he would like opened together, Mr. Osterberg explained that the first is for a design variance for a reduced front yard setback and the second is a design review type 3 application for the development.

Mr. Osterberg presented the Staff Report for VAR 99-00027, which is a request for a design variance for a reduced front yard setback for Waterford Park and mentioned that the development is for 40 town homes. He stressed that this is not a request for individual reduced front yard setbacks for each unit, and discussed the fee ownership subdivision, adding that 40 individual lots are being proposed plus other common area tracts and a web and buffer tract. He observed that the entire development is considered to have a single front yard, which is located on 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue and affects only one building that contains multiple units. He stated that the application is for a reduced 14-foot, rather than the required 20-foot, setback (a reduction of 6 feet), adding that staff has reviewed the request, finds that it meets the design variance criteria and recommends approval. The applicant has proposed a distinctive and unique building plan and overall project design, and both the frontages to Flagstone Drive and to 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue will have the same setback.

Mr. Osterberg presented the Staff Report for BDR 99-00223, which is a Design Review Type 3 application for Waterford Park, adding that staff has reviewed the request, finds that it meets the design review criteria and recommends approval. He offered to respond to any questions at this time.

Ms. Cannon mentioned a supplemental piece of information regarding fences, questioning what type of fence it refers to.

Mr. Osterberg observed that he believes this particular fence is a board on board cedar fence, explaining that the applicant has submitted multiple alternatives for fencing and requests that the board approves all alternatives, allowing them to make a final decision later on which specific type of fencing. He reported that staff has no objection to this request, adding that they have reviewed the options and find that most are basically similar, with the majority of the fencing being the PVC white fencing in a variety of picket designs. He noted that the applicant is



also requesting greater latitude or variation regarding the material used for retaining walls.

On the request of Ms. Crane, Mr. Osterberg displayed color options for the project for review.

**APPLICANT:**

**DOUGLAS MULL**, 9525 SW 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Beaverton, OR, president of Dolphin Development Inc., longtime Beaverton resident with a Beaverton-based business, appeared in support of the applications. Noting that they had more or less pioneered row house development in the southwest Beaverton area, he discussed marketing of different row house designs, adding that he would like to demonstrate the evolution of the product that is being offered to the public. He noted that he has a three-dimensional presentation that has been prepared from the actual survey in the engineering drawings – the Auto Cad drawings – which is literal, as opposed to rendering what it might look like. While it appears the applicant is requesting a great deal of latitude, Mr. Mull indicated that he will clarify this during a pause in the presentation, at which time he will show where the fencing actually goes. He assured the Board that they had repeatedly met with the neighbors and attempted to address their concerns, adding that some of the neighbors are present, they are welcome and he hopes to meet with their approval.

Observing that a picture is worth a thousand words, Mr. Mull began his presentation on the screen, observing that he had been in this particular business for 29 years and these tools were not available. Noting that Dolphin Development is a Beaverton-based firm, he displayed some pictures of Molly Park down the street. Emphasizing that every attempt is made to be as environmentally sensitive as possible, he disclosed that they had preserved large portions of many of their projects for the public. He explained that these illustrations serve as a review to allow him to discuss the evolution of the product in terms other than those of the project currently proposed. Because his firm is local and most of the Board is familiar with who they are and what they do, he suggested moving on to the current issue, unless the Board requests that background material.

Chairman Williams agreed that this particular portion of the presentation is unnecessary.

Mr. Mull, discussed items of concern that had been brought up in the neighborhood meeting process, specifically: the 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue Frontage, the bus stop, building heights, window boxes, color schemes, scalloped fencing, street trees, alley way foliage, arial surround and Avalon Park. He described and displayed the project, moving around screen, allowing those present to experience what this development will look like. He started off showing Flagstone Drive and 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue, indicating a portion that has been a Christmas Tree Farm, is zoned for R-2 and will be a multi-family site as well. Behind this, he illustrated the

creek and the wetlands that are located between this site and the Aspen Crest Rowhouse Development.

Observing that they had met repeatedly with the neighbor who lives across the street, Mr. Mull noted that the entry of this particular neighborhood would be located on Flagstone Drive. Noting that the applicant has had a struggle with the curb appeal and the frontage roads associated with this project, he pointed out that the transportation requirements provide that they have no accesses directly onto the frontage roads, which results in a less-desirable back orientation to the houses. He indicated a fire exit, adding that they have been conditioned by the Fire Department to provide for turf block, which he has installed in the past. He identified the white vinyl fencing, as well as several unique features of the development, including that each house a different color, five color schemes are available and there are four different front elevations – the same elevation does not also have the same color scheme. Noting that these are the same color schemes as Cougar Ridge, he emphasized that this feature had been very well received by the public because it tends to individualize the row houses and does not have that monolithic appearance created by houses of the same color which had been a common practice until recently. He commented that they are also pleased with the new vinyl siding, which features a lot of details, including caps, shutters and colonial trims in a durable product that requires little maintenance. This, in turn, reduces the need for large reserves, allowing more individuals to qualify for home ownership and the project stays looking nice a lot longer. In response to the Neighborhood Association, they had suggested scalloped fencing, which they would like to install along the front yards.

Mr. Mull reported that because of the grade restraints, there is a retaining wall about two feet tall, and the packet calls for Keystone block, although he would like to amend the application to allow for exposed aggregate, adding that they had no feasible method of planting the bases for the fencing. Noting that they really like the vinyl fencing, which has been very popular in Cougar Ridge, adding that there are now UV inhibitors in the fiber that prevents the material from fading. The color is solid all the way through, there is no splitting or checking, and it requires virtually no maintenance. He noted that this is opposed to having the backs of the homes with a six-foot tall cedar fence, which does not look as attractive after a few years as these will. He indicated a planter strip and a sidewalk, a separation created by the wall and the fencing, noting that they had provided approximately three times the landscaping normally required. He expressed his desire to put their best foot forward to the community for this neighborhood, emphasizing the importance of the attractiveness of the orientation of the homes to the street. He pointed out that the project will be more pedestrian friendly, because there will be access from the homes to the frontage road. They have allowed for parking for two additional cars of the houses, which has been an issue in these neighborhoods, due to the density. There should also be a reduction in the amount of graffiti normally found on the fencing in similar projects.

Mr. Mull mentioned that the neighbors have expressed concern with the school bus stop located on a particular corner, and the applicant intends to continue the vinyl fencing all the way around to provide a barrier, to prevent children from entering the heavily-landscaped area, which also contains a detention pond. Special plantings of a prickly nature will provide a further barricade and hopefully discourage children from entering that area. He observed that this particular area is heavily landscaped because there is very little slope on the site, adding that it is kind of crowned, with landscaping on both ends of the site. This also provides an open-space amenity at the front of the project and reduces the appearance of density. A number of features have been included to make the houses more individual, including staggered each house at two-foot intervals and two-foot heights. The back yards are relatively small, with six-foot cedar fencing at the back for privacy, and each owner will landscape these areas to suit their own individual needs and preferences. This landscaping (following submittal of a landscaping plan for approval) must be completed within four months of occupancy, providing for flexibility in the event occupancy occurs in the middle of winter. In order to allow for some design flexibility to meet market demand for those who would like to individualize their homes, they have provided an option of bay windows.

Ms. Cannon questioned what is shown in the illustration above the window box.

Mr. Mull informed Ms. Cannon that the feature she is referencing is a colonial cap.

Ms. Cannon requested that Mr. Mull return to a prior illustration that features a bay window.

Mr. Straus indicated that she is making reference to a roof.

Mr. Mull stated that there is a roof located over that bay window.

Ms. Cannon noted that she had been confused by the 3-D presentation.

Mr. Mull commented that there are shutters to provide accent, and then a plant shelf – an interior plant shelf. He identified a window box next door, explaining that the Sexton Neighborhood has a Window Box Gardening Club, which had provided examples of the product for the applicant to provide for their buyers, adding that these could even be installed after market. He indicated that there will be window box literature available at their information center, adding that individuals are welcome to join this club and have their own individual gardens outside, in addition to landscaping represented in the yards. The vinyl fencing provides access to the yards for maintenance, and the Homeowner's Association is responsible for the exterior maintenance on the buildings and on the landscaping, except for where they are enclosed in the back yard areas. An option will be available for a gate, with a latch, rather than a lock. He illustrated the

different front elevations, different color schemes, the attractive landscaping, exposed aggregate sidewalks, planter strips and street trees.

Mr. Mull expressed his opinion that the applicant is providing a superior product, relative to the competitors. He commented that 92% of their visitors are single individuals qualifying on one income, adding that the price range allows for qualification on a single income. He emphasized that no matter how attractive a property is, if it can not be offered in a price range that a single buyer can afford, there will be a problem. Neighbors do not want a stalled project, and had expressed concern with the affordability issue. Buyers don't want all the houses to look the same – they want to retain an atmosphere of individuality. There is also the issue of high maintenance costs, which is partially alleviated by the vinyl sidings. He discussed the five color schemes, noting that vinyl is not available in very dramatic colors – they are more subtle. He observed that they are extremely happy with the color schemes they are able to offer, which provide as much contrast as possible, adding that a decorator had selected the accent colors included with each color scheme. With the four separate front elevations, they have managed to generate the feeling of a considerable amount of variety while still maintaining the overall appearance necessary to obtain design approval for this apartment-type process. He described gable details, vents, shutters and windows and landscaping to help reduce the scale of the buildings. Neighbors had expressed concern with the street trees, and he provided illustration of the appearance of the landscaping and the street trees as they mature along the two frontage streets.

Mr. Mull entered into the interior of the neighborhood, into the alley, illustrating the landscaping, the planter strips between each driveway, and off-street parking, adding that there will be no parking in the fire lanes. He described the side-by-side garages and vinyl railings up on top, adding that these railings are in specific locations and he will be providing this disc as evidence in this hearing to indicate where these railings will be located. He observed that while this railing style is colonial, it is not scalloped, pointing out that they want the perimeter fences scalloped and the deck rails colonial, which is more user-friendly. He identified privacy walls located between the decks of each house.

Ms. Cannon questioned whether lighting would be provided in the back.

Mr. Mull discussed the lighting in the back, which will be all recessed lighting – it is directional and does not protrude out into the neighborhood.

Ms. Cannon questioned the location of this lighting.

Mr. Mull informed Ms. Cannon that the lighting is recessed into the overhangs and is hooded in the back. He described the clean, crisp appearance that eliminates glare into adjoining yards. Lighting in back does not protrude out into neighborhood, recessed in overhangs, no glare into yards. He discussed the park

area that contains the other detention pond, indicated the separation of the homes, the cedar fencing and a third type of fencing, which is the reason for their request for some flexibility on the fencing. . This fencing had been introduced because the owners are not allowed to encroach upon the wetland area buffer area which is being restored. They had elected to install see-through rail fencing in this area, to provide a delineation to allow the owners to landscape within that area, subject approval, while allowing them to enjoy the natural habitat beyond their property. The adjoining neighbors will have a beautiful view, good circulation and bike racks in a pedestrian-friendly environment. Noting that they had made amendments in response to facilities review requirements and to gain staff approval, he requested approval of the project and offered to respond to any questions at this time.

Mr. Lemon requested clarification that the streets will all be constructed according to City standards and whether the streets and walks will be turned over to the City of Beaverton.

Mr. Mull observed that there are public streets involved, adding that this had been one of the main problems in the project. He noted that the transportation/planning rule does not necessarily apply to this project with regard to access. He mentioned that traffic studies had been done, adding that they had agreed that there are both public streets and private streets within the project. He mentioned that this, of course, is included in the maintenance agreement and by-laws. The street lights on the public street is installed by the applicant and the cost is paid by the City of Beaverton, while street lights on the private streets will be covered by the association's meter. There is an irrigation system included in all landscaping and a perpetual contract for the landscape maintenance. He expressed confidence in their very competent management company – Northwest Community Management – who conducts all studies, manages financial aspects of the project, ensures adherence to the CC & Rs, handles complaints, parking issues, pet issues and various other issues that may arise from this type of higher-density individual housing.

Mr. Lemon questioned public street lighting on a certain street.

Mr. Osterberg nodded his head, indicating that public street lighting, constructed according to City standards, will be present on the street indicated by Mr. Lemon.

On question, Mr. Mull informed Mr. Lemon that a meter would be installed for the Neighborhood Association to be responsible for lighting on the private streets and alleyways. He added that they had responded to the Neighborhood Association with regard to the style of these fixtures, noting that during the extensive Facility Review Process, it had been determined that no variances will be requested and all streets will be built to meet City code and fire standards.

Mr. Mull introduced **MARK FERRIS** 9600 SW Oak Street #230, Portland, OR 97223, who is a principal with Alpha Engineering, the landscape architect for the Waterford Park Project and **ANDY KELLY** 2601 SW Sherwood Drive, Portland, OR 97201, who has been providing assistance with the acquisitions and approvals for the Waterford Park Project.

Mr. Mull explained that he has been involved in similar projects for 29 years, adding that he enjoys working within his own community and that they mostly limit their activities to South Beaverton. Noting that he had been at this for 29 years, he added that he enjoys working within the community and South Beaverton and offered to respond to further questions regarding this project.

Chairman Williams requested that Mr. Mull illustrate one of the front doors of the project, at which time he questioned the depth of the overhang in front of the door.

Mr. Mull informed Chairman Williams that this overhang is two-feet deep, adding that there are three different doors available. He noted that 84% of their purchasers are female, some of whom prefer the solid doors for security, while others appreciate the upgraded glass doors offered, and that a third option is a panel door. He emphasized that these doors are alternated – one with a circle head, one with side lights, one that is a plain panel, and a fourth door that includes glass.

Mr. Lemon questioned the lighting in the soffet over the door.

Mr. Mull clarified that the light is located right over the front door in a recessed can. He added that they intend to accomodate Mr. Osterberg's request that the lights on the wetland area be hooded so they don't extend out into that area, adding that these will also be on the backs of the houses in the neighborhoods that face the south.

Mr. Mull thanked those present for their patience, adding that the usual two-dimensional exhibits are available for review as well.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

This being the time for public testimony, comments and questions on this Public Hearing, Chairman Williams observed that there was none.

On question, Mr. Osterberg noted that he has no further comments at this time.

Chairman Williams closed the public portion of the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lemon **MOVED** and Ms. Cannon **SECONDED** a motion to approve VAR 99-00027 – Waterford Park Design Variance, based upon the testimony, reports

and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated March 23, 2000, including Condition Nos. 1 through 6.

Mr. Osterberg observed that the applicant would like to verify that the amended proposal includes aggregate wall, rather than keystone, out front.

Chairman Williams informed Mr. Osterberg that the amended proposal to include the aggregate wall, rather than keystone, out front will be included in BDR 99-00223 – Waterford Park Type 3 Design Review, rather than this motion for the Design Variance.

Mr. Osterberg thanked Chairman Williams, noting that he had merely wished to clarify this situation for the applicant.

Motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

Mr. Lemon **MOVED** Ms. Cannon **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 99-00223 – Waterford Park Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated March 23, 2000, including conditions 1 – 19, with the addition of following condition:

**20. The retaining wall system on SW 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue and SW Flagstone Drive shall be changed to cast-in-place concrete with an exposed aggregate finish, in lieu of the keystone system.**

Mr. Straus questioned whether any provisions need to be made to provide clarification for placement of the various types of fences.

Chairman Williams informed Mr. Straus that this provision is covered.

Mr. Straus commented he had a concern with how this particular issue will be entered into public record.

Mr. Osterberg indicated that it is not necessary for the Board of Design Review to take any further action on this issue, adding that the applicant had provided the illustration indicating placement of the fences, which will serve this purpose.

Ms. Cannon, congratulated Mr. Osterberg and Mr. Mull for their efforts on the variance on 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue, expressing her opinion that it really looks great. She emphasized that she would like to see this happen frequently on this type of a project on the main streets, adding that the appearance is that of a neighborhood, rather than a misplaced parking lot.

Mr. Osterberg thanked Ms. Cannon for her compliment, noting that the developer had provided a great design and he had been glad to provide assistance.

Motion **CARRIED** unanimously

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes of March 9, 2000, as written, were submitted. Chairman Williams asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Lemon **MOVED** and Ms. Crane **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

Motion **CARRIED**, with the abstention of Ms. Cannon, Ms. Crane, Mr. Lemon and Mr. Straus who abstained from voting on this issue, as they had not been present at this meeting.

The minutes of February 24, 2000, as written, were submitted. Chairman Williams asked if there were any changes or corrections. Ms. Cannon **MOVED** and Ms. Crane **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

Motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Mr. Straus who abstained from voting on this issue, as he had not been present at this meeting.

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.